Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A certain incoherence in literary form is thus produced, but this will be readily overlooked in view of the body of valuable material, ancient and modern, here brought to bear upon the Oxyrhynchus problem.

Dr. Taylor explains the present in λέγει as didactic, not historical. The absence of the article from Ἰησοῦς he does not discuss. Yet it is striking, and must be significant. He thinks the scribe should have written τοῦ κόσμου in Logion II, *i. e.*, "Except ye fast *from* the world," and cites telling parallels from Clement of Alexandria. He unites Logia III and IV, assuming but one line to have been lost at the foot of the verso. In V he accepts the shrewd conjecture of Professor Blass, and reads, "Wheresoever there be two, they are not godless; and where there is one only, I say, I am with him." The apocryphal gospels appear most prominently in the last pages of the essay, where parallels are given from the Evangelium Thomæ and others.

The author has no theory to maintain, and recognizes that where the evidence is inconclusive he does not have to conclude. But he says and cites much that is illuminating for the study of these logia. The book is without an index, which is especially unfortunate in view of the variety of writers, works, and topics dealt with.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

PAPIAS AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES. A Study of Religious Thought in the Second Century. By EDWARD H. HALL. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1899. Pp. 314. $1.25.

THIS little volume is an attempt to give an account in popular form of the rise of traditional Christianity. It assumes that the first century is shrouded in quite a dense fog, and that only in the second is it possible to see the beliefs emerging distinctly which show us the processes by which historic Christianity finally took shape. The author modestly disclaims originality; but he is well versed in the researches of modern criticism, and cordially sympathizes with its most negative types. He uses Papias to introduce his readers to what he considers the process by which the gospels attained their present form and authority. He admits that the information thus obtained is quite vague and capable of several interpretations, but concludes that it is doubtful if Papias had our gospels, and that at any rate he did not regard any gospels as authoritative. The account of Papias is followed by brief accounts of the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, pseudo-Barnabas,

Hermas, as well as of the "Didache" and "the Gospel of Peter." The object is to show that these writers did not recognize any authoritative gospels. This is followed by an account of two representative thinkers, Justin and Marcion. The chiliastic views of the second-century Christians are next described; then the line of theological speculators, beginning with Paul and including especially the chief Gnostics, while the concluding chapter on "The Mystic Gospel" describes the fourth gospel as an effort to idealize the person and teaching of Jesus.

The book is written with much skill. The author has a persuasive style, with a touch of irony in it, and succeeds in representing the whole historic process which he describes as so misty and vague that the average reader will probably feel that nothing very certain is known about the beginnings of Christianity. The book is, of course, open to serious criticism. It is strange that, if the earliest assured literary remains of Christianity were to be selected as the groundwork of the study, the epistles of Paul were not chosen instead of the fragments of Papias. It is unfortunate, too, that in discussing Papias the author does not give any account of what Papias' book was. The theory that he did not have at least some, if not all, of our gospels before him has been given up even by Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 663). The natural inference is that his λόγια κυριακά, of which he wrote expositions, were these gospels; and the usage of λόγια in the New Testament, Philo, and the early Fathers supports the inference that by this term were meant inspired books. On these λόγια Papias wrote interpretations, which he further illustrated by carefully collecting oral traditions. If so, our author's whole representation of the matter is wrong, and Papias really proves that in the first half of the second century our gospels were so generally accepted as the authoritative and divinely provided records of Christ's life and teaching that the bishop of Hierapolis was moved to write the first commentary upon them. This is but a sample of what we think the utterly misleading impression conveyed by Dr. Hall of the bearing of criticism on the origin of Christianity.

GEORGE T. PURVES.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.